Tells the Facts and Names the Names

CounterPunch

MARCH 1-15, 1999 *Alexander Cockburn and Jeffrey St. Clair* **VOL. 6, NO. 5**

■ IN THIS ISSUE

THE PRINCE OF WALES: BRITAIN'S STANDARD-BEARER FOR THE COUNTER CULTURE AND POLITICAL ECOLOGY

- Defiant Charles Nixes Blair's Order to Shut Down Anti-Monsanto Website, Lashes Out At the Genetic-Industrial Complex

IT DOESN'T ONLY HAPPEN IN NEW JERSEY

- The Stunning Facts on Cop Pull-Overs

OUR LITTLE SECRETS

- Are Greenspan's Days Numbered? Fed Chairman's Ticker Problem
- "We Want Yair": Israelis Unleash Pollard-Type Campaign to Save Man of Darkness
- The Dimming of Albright
- Pacifica: Yes, The News Was Bad, Very Bad

Racial Typing on the Highways

Driving While Black

The issue of racial profiling by police briefly grabbed the attention of the press when New Jersey Governor Christine Todd Whitman recently fired the head of the state police after he accused blacks and hispanics of being more likely to be drug dealers and therefore deserving of heightened police scrutiny. Whitman earned glowing coverage for her swift action.

In fact, Whitman has sedulously ignored the problem for most of her term, insisting that racial profiling is not a practice of the state police. Even after two New Jersey state troopers fired eleven shots into a van carrying four black men on their way to a basketball clinic last winter Whitman clung to her contention that the action was not racially motivated. In 1995 a New Jersey state judge threw out charges against fifteen black drivers who, the judge said, had been pulled over without cause. During the trial it emerged that on a 26-mile long stretch on the southern part of the New Jersey Turnpike minorities accounted for 46 percent of the drivers stopped, even though they were only 15 percent of the speeders.

Whitman also kept her mouth shut in early February when Emblez Longoria, a New Jersey state trooper, filed suit against his department claiming that he was being pressured to make illegal stops of black and hispanic drivers in order to fulfill his arrest quotas. Longoria, who is hispanic, alleges that he was denied promotions and harassed by his superiors when he refused to pull over drivers using racial profiling. Ultimately, Whitman's hand was forced by the racist remarks of Col. Carl Williams, the head of the New Jersey state police. Responding to a report showing that 75 percent of all motorists arrested on the New Jersey Turnpike in the first two months of 1997 were minorities, Williams told the Newark Star-Ledger that cocaine and marijuana traffickers were most likely to be either black or hispanic. Williams was canned, but don't expect much more action than that. The investigation of his Department has been in the hands of Attorney General Peter Verniero, who has fiercely denied that New Jersey cops use profiling. Black leaders in New Jersey have demanded that Verniero's investigation be taken up by an independent panel. But Whitman has refused and instead has nominated Verniero for a spot on the New Jersey Supreme Court.

But racial profiling is neither new nor isolated to the Garden State. Criminology has had these genetic typing obsessions as far back as eugenicists such as Cesare Lombroso, who attempted to define criminal types through head shapes and other physical characteristics. Particularly influential in the US was Earnest Albert Hooten, a Harvard professor of anthropology and appalling racist who published The American Criminal in 1939. Now these racist theories have pervaded the policing system of the United States from coast to coast. To be a black driver in America is to invite police scrutiny, as thousands are daily singled out for groundless pull-overs, "pretext" stops, and subjected to intrusive, warrantless searches and abusive treatment by police.

The problem is not merely one of racist cops, but of a policing system that encourages and promotes racial typing. In Amherst, Massachusetts, the police department held seminars for its officers on "perpetrator profiles". The officers were told that "interracial couples" were more likely to be engaged in drug dealing than white couples.

(**Racial Typing** *continued on page 5)*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our Little Secret

Greenspan in Heart-Stopping Rally

Keen eyed investors peering through the plate glass windows of the exercise room at the Chevy Chase Country Club in north-west Washington have been watching the tennis court with more than usual attention lately. Fed Chairman Alan Greenspan's morning workouts with the tennis pro appear to be leaving the guardian of global financial stability in a worrying state of semi-collapse, red faced and gasping for breath, after intense sessions bounding about the court in pursuit of the merciless volleys of his opponent.

Some suspect a plot in progress: the pro shorts the S&P 500, then drives Greenspan to a heart seizure. Markets crash worldwide; the pro and those on the stairmasters with cell phones close at hand clean up. Fiendish, yet so simple. Alan, stay in bed with Ayn Rand!

Israelis to Bill: "Spring Klein"

Bill Clinton was recently balked by the collective fury of the intelligence chiefs in his scheme to release convicted spy Jonathan Pollard as a sop to Bibi Netanyahu. Now he is being presented with another opportunity to assist the release of an Israeli from chokey.

Col. Yair Klein (retd), late of the Israeli paratroopers and police anti-terror squad has long pursued a lucrative career marketing his "anti-terror" expertise to mass murderers. Nine years ago Klein achieved notoriety when it emerged that among his clients had been some of the more bloodthirsty Colombian cocaine traffickers. The drug lords, especially the late Gonzalo Rodriguez Gacha, had paid Klein $800,000 to instruct their killers in the finer points of assassination (he once proudly demonstrated to Counterpunch contributor Andrew Cockburn the correct method of mowing someone down from a moving car) as well as bomb-making. As a morale booster, Klein taught his pupils to chant "Communists, we drink your blood" during the instruction courses. The Colombian authorities have long cherished a desire to get their hands on Klein, especially as the bomb that blew up an Avianca airliner in 1989 bore the hallmarks of his expertise.

The drug lords paid Klein $800,000 to instruct them in the finer points of assassination.

Two months ago Bogota prosecutors received the happy news that Klein was in jail in Freetown, Sierra Leone. He had been apprehended on suspicion of ministering to the needs of the Revolutionary United Front, the rebel group that enforces authority in areas it controls by chopping off the hands of children as well as adults. The attractions for Klein of a contract with the RUF would include access to the lucrative trade in smuggled diamonds.

Hardly had news of Klein's incarceration began to circulate in diplomatic channels when the U.S. State Department began receiving a flurry of agitated messages from Jerusalem. The Israelis first requested, then demanded, that the U.S. use its influence with what passes for a government in Sierra Leone to spring Klein and return him to Israel forthwith and furthermore to make absolutely sure that the Colombians did not get their hands on him.

The stripe-pant Arab lovers at State resisted these importunate demands. But now friends of CounterPunch report that the matter is being raised at "a higher level", ie with the White House. Those in the government who feel it is about time that Klein answered for his crimes in front of a court are not optimistic about the outcome. "It looks like the White House will be happy to oblige", reports one source.

Madeleine's Mess-Ups

One of the most enduring farces in American foreign policy was underway in China the first week of March: a US Secretary of State, in this case Madeleine Albright, engaging in "tough talk" about human rights.

Just how tough the talk really was can be gauged by the fact that Albright also publicly reaffirmed US policy of not linking trade and human rights. To underline the point, she is encouraging China to join the World Trade Organization, the US-dominated group of nations dedicated to affirming the primacy of foreign commerce over any other priorities, human, moral and spiritual.

One can't blame the Chinese for getting irritated at these posturings, even as US firms flood into China to take advantage of cheap labor, child labor, prison labor, slave labor. Of course the niceties have to be observed. To take one example, Disney has a splendid code of corporate conduct, which recommends compliance with China's labor laws. These, on paper, stipulate a 40-hour work week, two days rest a week and a maximum of three hours overtime a day.

Meanwhile investigators from the Hong Kong Christian Industrial Committee recently described the Disney code as "just a piece of paper. It is not seriously respected in many factories which produce Disney's products." Chan Ka Wai, who was involved in producing the report on Chinese labor practices, said that in some factories making Disney products workers had spent 16 hours a day at their posts, sometimes up to seven days a week. In some cases, the pay for five hours overtime was no more than a few cents. In other cases workers hadn't been paid for three months.

There have been plenty of other reports discussing the awfulness of Chinese labor practices, including straightforward slave

Editors
Alexander Cockburn
Jeffrey St. Clair

Co-writer
Andrew Cockburn

Design
Deborah Thomas

Counselor
Ben Sonnenberg

Published twice monthly except August, 22 issues a year:
$40 individuals,
$100 institutions,
$30 student/low-income
CounterPunch.
All rights reserved.
CounterPunch welcomes all tips, information and suggestions.
CounterPunch
3220 N. St., NW, Suite 346
Washington, DC, 20007
1-800-840-3683 (phone)
1-800-967-3620 (fax)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

camps of Chinese prisoners. The idea that a few quiet words of moral reproof from Madeleine Albright, or a US president, is going to make a difference is an insult to human intelligence. No one believes it.

There is no inherent virtue in having workers in country A produce goods for export to country B. There is nothing intrinsically good about foreign trade, however much the individuals who make money out of such activities protest to the contrary. China has a growing class of local entrepreneurs only too happy to muster ill-paid peasant laborers to work long hours in awful conditions, so that these entrepreneurs can get their cut of the export action. The peasants now crammed into these factories can no longer return to lands once communally farmed but now stolen by other entrepreneurs and relentlessly degraded. These workers' lot is akin to those British peasants whose common lands were stolen in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries while they were herded into mills, working more than 70 hours a week making cheap exports, kept going on tea, sugar and gin, while their daughters went into prostitution to help keep the family afloat.

The only way to end these patterns of exploitation, degrading almost beyond the imagination of man, is to stipulate flatly that trade dependent on such exploitation is infamous. Would one buy a pair of trousers made by a brutalized prisoner in a US penitentiary paid a few cents a month while unionized textile workers starve? Hopefully not. Would one buy a similar pair of trousers made by a Chinese prisoner working 80 hours a week for no pay? Hopefully not. And the only way to insure this is not just to wag one's finger at the prison wardens here or in China but to forbid or drastically penalize the sale of such products. There's no other way. Who wants a pair of prison-made pants with a bogus stamp of approval? This is like a meat-eater wanting a stamp on his beefsteak saying the cow died happy under the stun gun.

At the dawn of her career at State, CounterPunch recorded the view of Albright's less than admiring UN colleagues that she was "lazy, ignorant and stupid". This view is now becoming common currency, particularly after the debacle at the recent Rambouillet summit on the Kosovo crisis, where Albright made a more than usually conspicuous fool of herself, to the enormous joy of her great rival, Richard Holbrooke, whose schadenfreude was so palpable it dripped off his face like treacle.

PACIFICA: YES, THEY DID IT

The Pacifica Foundation had its long-awaited meeting in Berkeley at the end of February. As CounterPunch readers had been forewarned, the governing board voted to shut off democratic access and accountability. Board chair Mary Frances Berry and her colleagues ignored the appeals of such prominent intellectuals as Noam Chomsky, Howard Zinn and Edward Herman, and chose to flourish a letter from Corporation for Public Broadcasting, clearly designed to influence the vote, by demanding compliance to CPB rules which allegedly prohibit advisory board members in the Pacifica network being on the governing board.

Richard Holbrooke's schadenfreude dripped off his face like treacle.

On February 28 in Berkeley the governing board of the Pacifica Foundation voted unanimously to approve a modification of the corporation's by-laws, transferring the authority for nominating governing board members entirely to the governing board, and outlawing concurrent service on the governing board and a station advisory board.

Prior to that, a majority of governing board members were required to have been nominated by and from advisory boards, two each from the five member stations. Immediately following the vote, the members originating from station advisory boards resigned from those advisory boards so that they could remain members of the Pacifica Foundation.

The CPB threat appears to have been crucial in forcing the issue in the face of rising fury both within Pacifica and without. Chair Mary Frances Berry was accompanied at all times by a bodyguard as a result of herself and several others within Pacifica having received anonymous death threats. Up to four armed, uniformed police were present, one of whom commented that the Pacifica Board was almost as bad as the UC Regents. At the meeting programmer Larry Bensky, who in the past has made public statements of support for the changes occurring at Pacifica, noted in a statement circulated to the public, "I believe it is nevertheless worth considering some means of election to local and national boards. Elections don't automatically mean democracy, but it is hard to have democracy without elections. There is much creative thinking to be done in this area."

The by-law changes adopted thus culminate at least two years of sustained effort to bring self-nomination about through various means. At the last moment, governing board members previously from station advisory boards negotiated policy language suggesting maintenance of an important role for station advisory boards, but these agreements, like NAFTA side-agreements, include no enforcement mechanism. As policy statements, they may be changed at will by the board in the future. In contrast, subsequent alteration of the by-laws will require a 2/3 majority of a group that has just voted unanimously in their favor.

With this vote, the network that emphasizes how dependent it is on its listeners for all its support at fund drive time, has emphasized that it is more fearful of loss of government funds than of subscriber funds. The subscribers can be misled or replaced.

Perhaps the only solution is for outraged listeners to pool their money, to be witheld until Pacifica acts as it speaks. The fifteen members of the Pacifica Governing Board seem to respond only to the demands of money in the aggregate, rather than to the demands of people or principle. Those interested in contributing to the legal effort to reverse these changes may send checks to: Siegel and Yee Trust Account (write "Save Pacifica" in the memo area of your check), 499 14th Street #220, Oakland, CA 94612.

MORE ON STROM

A CounterPuncher in Chicago sends us this anecdote about America's oldest senator: "Some years ago the early-teenaged daughters of friends living in McLean Va. recounted a story they said came from a classmate of theirs, none other than one of Strom's daughters: Seems the eminent solon was striding into a D.C. hotel lobby with his entourage when a smiling little girl approached him. Strom: 'Why, honey, you remind me of my own daughtah!'

"Little girl: 'I AM your daughtah!'" ■

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now England Has Its Nader

Prince Charles' Crusade

Prince Charles is now being hailed by foes of the genetic-industrial complex as their doughty champion. Near the end of February the Prince was vainly ordered by Labor prime minister Tony Blair to shut down his royal website (www.princeofwales.gov.uk) which has been featuring vigorous denunciations by the heir apparent of what in Britain is termed GM, that is, genetically modified crops. (In the US, the equivalent term is GE, genetically engineered crops.)

As befits a long-term organic farmer, the Prince links genetically modified crops to the blight of an agriculture dependent on chemicals, raising questions of poor land management and baneful ecological practices which leave "sterile fields offering little or no food or shelter to wild life". Genetic material, the Prince thunders in one posting, "does not stay where it is put. Pollen is spread by the wind and by insects. GM crops can contaminate conventional and organic crops growing nearby. This cannot be right."

The Prince continues, "I wonder about the claims that some GM crops are essential to feed the world's growing populations. Is it really true? Isn't the problem sometimes lack of money rather than lack of food? And how will the companies who own this technology make a sufficient profit from selling their products to the world's poorest people? Wouldn't it be better to concentrate instead on the sustainable techniques which can double or treble the yields from traditional farming systems?"

Prince Charles concludes by zeroing in on one of the paramount political issues, demanding that "effective and comprehensive schemes to ensure that those consumers like me who do not want to eat GM foods can avoid them."

It might seem an irony to some that the British heir apparent should be adopting a principled, enlightened position, in marked constrast to the social democrat and their leader, Blair. But their roles are entirely in character. Prince Charles has long been conspicuous for sensible and sometimes radical ecological positions—on the Amazon rain forest, on appropriate land use and resource management and on organic agriculture. He's no Johnny-Come-Lately to the issues, having gone into organic farming in the early 1980s.

On the other hand, Tony Blair's tradition of social democracy has always had a frenzied enthusiasm for supposed technological progress. It was Harold Wilson, leader of the Labor Party in the 1960s, who used to hymn "the white heat of technology". The tradition of rambling and rural hiking that used to mark British radicals has long since gone.

Far dearer to Blair's heart are the big corporations—most notably Monstano—which are now pushing their patents for genetically modified crops into Europe. The reason why Blair demanded that Prince Charles shut down his website (on the grounds that it constituted an unwarranted piece of political meddling by the Prince) is that the whole GM issue is politically hot in the UK at the moment, as it is throughout Europe.

It's not ironic that the Prince is adopting such an enlightened position, in contrast to Tony Blair.

The stakes are high for Monsanto's GM products. For example, the Consumers' Union estimates that Monsanto's bovine growth hormone, rBGH, could earn the company $500 million a year in the United States and another $1 billion a year internationally. The haul from Monsanto's Round-Up Ready soybeans, potatoes and corn and its terminator seeds could be substantially, perhaps tens of billions, more.

Monsanto has always been able to count on the aid of the United States government to promote its products. With the unceasing encouragement of the Department of Agriculture, American farmers have planted more than 50 million acres in Monsanto's genetically-engineered crops in just the past four years. The Food and Drug Administration has also played along, acceding to the company's demand that genetically-engineered crops not be labeled as such.

When faced with the almost certain prospect that the European Union would ban the import of Monsanto genetically-engineered corn in 1998, the company unleashed an unprecedented lobbying effort, flying a group of critical journalists to the United States, where they visited Monsanto's corporate headquarters and its labs. Then the scribes were taken to Washington, where they were given a tour of the White House, including a rare visit to the Oval Office. Top Clinton aides rallied to the company's defense, including US Trade rep Charlene Barshevsky, Secretary of State Madeleine Albright, Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman, and Commerce Secretary Bill Daley. All lobbied their European counterparts on behalf of the company. Even Bill Clinton and Al Gore got in on the act, engaging in some last minute arm-twisting of the Irish and French prime ministers. Both the French and the Irish caved in to the pressure by last July. This spring Monsanto's genetically-engineered corn will be planted in Europe for the first time.

Perhaps no American company has as zealously exploited the so-called revolving door as Monsanto, which has seized on ex-Clinton aides and federal bureaucrats to advance its interests in Washington.

Take the case of Michael Taylor. After graduating from law school at the University of Virginia in 1976, Taylor went to work for the Food and Drug Administration, eventually rising to the position of executive assistant to the FDA's adminstrator. Then Taylor left the federal government for a post in the high powered DC law firm of King and Spaulding. Taylor was the firm's specialist in food and drug matters pending for the FDA. During his tenure at King and Spaulding Taylor's clients included Coca-Cola, Carnation, the Food Biotechnology Council, and Monsanto. One of Taylor's duties was to represent Monsanto's efforts to get its bovine growth hormone approved by the FDA. Taylor left King and Spaulding in 1991 to rejoin the FDA, this time as Deputy Commissioner for Policy. In that position Taylor was responsible for writing guidelines on the use and marketing of the controversial hormone that were favorable to the company. Specifically, Taylor drafted guidelines that exempted milk producers from labeling dairy products from cows that had been treated with BGH. Now Taylor has returned to Monsanto, working on what the company calls "long range planning."

One of Taylor's former associates at

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the FDA, Dr. Nick Weber, recently leaked confidential notes from the European Commission on whether the Commission was going to approve the use of the company's bovine growth hormone. Weber passed on the notes to his boss at the FDA, Dr. Margaret Mitchell. Before joining the FDA, Mitchell had served as director of the Monsanto lab working on the hormone. The notes helped Monsanto prepare its arguments in advance of the September meeting. Monsanto's application was approved on a tie-vote when the US chair of the committee determined "by the chairman's privilege" that a tie vote meant approval.

The company may have secured its biggest coup in 1997, when it brough onto its board Mickey Kantor, the former Secretary of Commerce and one of Bill Clinton's closest advisers. It was Kantor who opened the doors to the White House and got the administration to threaten the European Union on the matter of Monsanto's genetically-engineered grain.

Kantor's new law firm, Mayer, Brown & Platt, watches out for the company's interests in matters of international trade, food safety and product labelling. Prior to Kantor's arrival at the firm in 1997, one of Mayer, Brown & Platt's top lobbyists was William Daley. Daley was tapped by Bill Clinton to fill Kantor's spot in the cabinet as Secretary of Commerce. In that capacity, he has led the charge for Monsanto on several continents.

Back in Britain, the Labor government, secure on top of its vast majority, is nonetheless embarassed by blunders on the GM issue. It has emerged that Lord Sainsbury, Labor's science minister who is deeply involved in GM decision-making had financial stakes in GM companies as well as his own familial connection ($36 million in dividends) to the vast Sainsbury retail empire, which markets genetically modified tomatoes.

Prince Charles commands a considerable measure of public support from Britons deeply suspicious of scientific manipulation of their admittedly dreadful food. The Sixties live on, in the most surprising locations. About sixty percent of the Prince Charles weltanschauung mirrors exactly that of a well-educated America hippie coming to maturity in the late 1960s. After all, organic agriculture in America owes much to the hippies, as does Humboldt Gold, an example of biological manipulation of the most uplifting sort. ■

(Racial Typing, *continued*)

In San Diego, the police are ever vigilant to pull over black people driving expensive cars. In October of 1997, a black man named Shawn Lee and his girlfriend were stopped by the California Highway Patrol on Interstate 15. Lee, a member of the San Diego Chargers football team, and his girlfriend were handcuffed and held by police for more than an hour. The patrolman said that they were detained because Lee was driving a car that fit a description of one that had been reported as stolen that night. This story was false. Lee was driving a new Jeep Grand Cherokee. The stolen vehicle was a Honda.

A similar kind of racial typing is evident up the coast in supposedly liberal Santa Monica. In the fall of 1996, two police cars tailed Darryl Hicks and George Washington, two black men, as they pulled into the parking garage of their hotel. The police cruisers turned on their lights and at gun-point ordered the men out of their cars. The men were handcuffed and placed in separate police cars. Washington and Hicks' car was searched. The police claimed the men were being detained because they fit the description of suspects wanted in a string of nineteen armed robberies. The officers also said one of the men appeared to be "nervous". Washington and Hicks later sued the police officers for false arrest and civil rights violations. In ruling for the two men, the court determined that the armed robberies had not occurred in Santa Monica and that neither of the men fit the descriptions of the robbers.

Nowhere has racial typing in the name of drug interdiction been used as aggressively as in Maryland.

In Carmel, Indiana, an affluent suburb of Indianapolis, a state trooper pulled over a black man named David Smith. The trooper was unaware that Smith was a sergeant in the Carmel city police department and the sedan he was driving was actually an unmarked police car. Smith was ordered out of his car and, according to Smith, the trooper appeared to be "shocked and surprised" when he saw that Smith was wearing his police uniform. The trooper said he had pulled Smith over because he had three antennas on the back of his car.

A similar incident occurred in Orange County, Florida. In April of 1997, Aaron Campbell was pulled over by sheriff's deputies on the Florida Turnpike. The deputies ordered Campbell from the car, forced him to the pavement, drenched his face with pepper spray and arrested him. Campbell was a major in the Metro-Dade County police department and had identified himself as a policeman when he was pulled over. The Orange County deputies later said Campbell had been stopped for having an "obscured license tag" and for making an illegal lane change.

As is so often the case, the pretext for the profiling is the drug war, itself a ill-disguised form of state-sponsored racism. Nowhere has this kind of racial typing in the name of drug interdiction been used as aggressively as in Maryland, where since at least 1988 it has been the policy of the state troopers to pull over, detain and search drivers for drugs and guns, using a race-based "drug courier profile". According to the testimony of a Maryland State Trooper, those race profiles explicitly targeted: "1) young, black males wearing expensive jewelry; 2) driving expensive cars, usually sports cars; 3) carrying beepers; and 4) in possession of telephone numbers."

SUBSCRIPTION INFO

Enter/Renew Subscription here:

One year individual, $40
One year institution, $100
One year student/low income, $30
Please send back issue(s) _____ ($3/issue)
"I am enclosing a separate sheet for gift subscriptions"

Name _____

Address _____

City/State/Zip _____

_____

Payment must accompany order.
Add $10 for foreign subscriptions.
If you want **CounterPunch** emailed to you rather than sent through US mail, say so and supply your email address.
Make checks payable to: **CounterPunch.**
Return to: **CounterPunch.**
3220 N Street, NW, Suite 346
Washington, DC 20007

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In 1990, the state police set up a drug task force called "Special Traffic Interdiction Force", or STIF. STIF targeted drivers along Interstate 95 in northeastern Maryland. The unit was composed of six white troopers. Over the course of six years, the STIF unit, using the drug courier profile, pulled over and searched black drivers four times as often as they did whites. One of the troopers, Bernard M. Donovan, searched only black drivers.

In 1992, the Maryland State Police's Criminal Intelligence Division developed a "Confidential Criminal Intelligence Report", which troopers used to make stops and searches based on race. The report encouraged troopers in Allegheny County to increase searches of black male drivers by saying that "the county is currently experiencing a serious problem with the incoming flow of crack cocaine". The Intelligence Report professed that "the dealers and couriers (traffickers) are predominantly black males and females".

The Criminal Intelligence Report came to light through a lawsuit filed in 1993 by Robert Wilkins. Wilkins, a Harvard Law School graduate, was a public defender in Washington, DC. In May of 1992 he was returning to DC from a family funeral in Ohio in a rented Cadillac. He was accompanied by his aunt, uncle and a 29-year old cousin. Wilkins was pulled over by a trooper in western Maryland for speeding. He and his family were ordered out of the car and forced to stand in driving rain for more than an hour as the state trooper brought in drug-sniffing dogs to search the car. No drugs were found. Wilkins and the American Civil Liberties Union filed suit and, in 1995, won a substantial settlement from the Maryland State Police. As part of the Wilkins settlement, the state police agreed to compile a database of all stops of drivers on Maryland highways in which police ask to perform searches or in which a search is done by a drug-sniffing dog.

White motorists make up 78 per cent of Maryland highway traffic; while black drivers account for about 17 per cent and other minorities about 5 percent in the state. When the Wilkins data were submitted to the court in late 1998, they showed that between January 1, 1995 and December 15, 1997, more than 70 per cent of the people who were stopped and searched on Interstate 95 were black and about 77 per cent were minorities. Only about 23 per cent were white. The data also revealed that the vast majority of drivers who were stopped and searched and not found to be carrying any drugs were also black, more than 67 percent. The ACLU has used such data to bring a class action suit against the Maryland state police.

More than 70 per cent of the people who were stopped and searched on Interstate 95 were black.

Clearly, the Wilkins litigation did nothing alter the racist practices of the Maryland troopers as evidenced by the testimony of State Trooper Michael Lewis in a recent criminal case. Lewis told the court that he pulled over Robert Ware in large measure because he was a young, black man. Lewis admitted that he factored in the race of drivers on a daily basis as part of his drug interdiction work. In late 1998, the Maryland State Police assigned Lewis to a post as an instructor, training other troopers in how to identify potential drug couriers on the state's highways.

One of the plaintiffs in the ACLU suit is Nelson Walker, a native of Liberia and a student at the University of North Carolina. In April of 1995 Walker was stopped on Interstate 95, purportedly for failure to have his seatbelt buckled. The trooper who pulled him over insinuated that his 1990 Infiniti was too nice a car for Walker to be driving and ordered Walker and his passenger out of the car. Drug-detecting dogs were called for and then the car was searched for over an hour and a half. Walker and his friend, Mecca Agunabo I, were made to stand in the rain for nearly two hours while the car was searched.

When Agunabo said he needed to get out of the rain because he had just recently recovered from a bout with pneumonia, the trooper threatened to arrest him. In a search for drugs, the troopers rummaged through the men's luggage and other personal belongings. Then the troopers largely dismantled Walker's car, tearing out a door panel, the back seat and part of the sunroof. No drugs were found. One of the troopers went to his cruiser and returned with a screwdriver, which he handed to Walker saying, "Here, you're going to need this." ■

CounterPunch
3220 N Street, NW, Suite 346
Washington, DC 20007

Presorted
First Class Mail
U.S. Postage
PAID
Permit No. 269
Skokie, IL

First Class Mail

We present Monsanto's doughty foe: Prince Charles

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED